

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/585,925	RAFFERTY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hong Liu	1624	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hong Liu. (3)_____.

(2) Gayle O'Brien. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 20 January 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all the pending claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In the interview on January 20, 2004, the Examiner did not suggest replacing the earlier provisos excluding a subgenus with amendments so that species are excised. The Examiner indicated, however, that applicants may exclude certain speicies byprovisos to overcome the art rejection. With so much prior art applicable to the invention, It would be difficult to priviso out all the compounds that read on the intantly claimed compounds. The case can only be allowed when it is free from any prior art.